

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

Item		Action Owner
1.	Introductions	
	<p>██████████ (BCC), ██████████ (HS2), ██████████ (Moxon Architects), ██████████ (HS2), ██████████ (HS2), ██████████ (HS2), ██████████ (EK) introduced themselves.</p>	
2.	<p>Review of notes & actions from last meeting The minutes of the September meeting were agreed subject to one amendment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 8: Action on HS2 incorrect; should read: ‘HS2 to issue draft Planning Forum Notes on bridge and viaduct parapets and viaduct piers’. Action: HS2 to place minutes on website, as amended. <p>Outstanding actions: The Forum reviewed the action log and noted the following outstanding actions (full action list included in slide pack):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Appendix to PFN 6 (lorry routes) on conditions, and draft Planning Forum Note (Operational Noise). Updates and actions noted under item 9 on the agenda. • HS2 to consider how the likely iterative design development of noise mitigation could be best managed within the Sch17 process. Action: HS2 to update Forum at next meeting. • Sch 17 appeal - still no decision. S.81 (Building Act) appeal decided: four conditions were upheld and two dismissed. HS2 considering next steps. Action: HS2 to update Forum at next meeting on both appeals. • Woodland Fund. Release of next tranche of £4m funding still being worked through with DfT. Action: HS2 to update Forum at next meeting. • HS2 to issue draft Planning Forum Notes on overbridge and viaduct parapets and viaduct piers. Update and action noted under item 9 on the agenda. • Update on Prolonged Disturbance Scheme, and clarification of potential for overlap between Prolonged Disturbance Scheme and the Construction Complaints process. Update and action reported under item 10 on the agenda. • Safeguarding of broadband. Update under item 10 on the agenda. • Presentation from HS2 on how HS2 ensures compliance with route-wide undertakings. Action: HS2 to present at a future Planning Forum. 	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>3.</p>	<p>Phase 1 update</p> <p>██████████ (ML) updated the Forum on key Phase 1 activities as illustrated on the slides circulated separately in the Forum slide pack.</p> <p>ML noted the recent interview in New Civil Engineer with ██████████ (HS2 Ltd CEO). NTP (permission to go ahead with the construction phase) is expected in June 2019. This activity will impact on Schedule 17 submission programmes and HS2 will need to continue to liaise with local authorities on the details. The award of station construction partners at Old Oak Common and Euston is imminent.</p> <p>Action: TA asked that the New Civil Engineer article be circulated to the Planning Forum.</p> <p>TA asked if the intent was to have substantive Sch 17 approvals in place prior to NTP June 2019. SC said that some Sch 17 discussions will need to have been advanced by that date. PG said that the programme for Sch 17 submissions is being worked through and HS2 will be updating authorities on a bilateral basis.</p> <p>ML said that HS2 recognise Sch 17 submissions have a resource impact on LPAs and HS2 need to be flexible to support LPAs with their resourcing.</p> <p>██████████ summarized activities in north, central and south area in more detail, as illustrated in the Forum slide pack (the presentation included videos showing archaeological works and progress on works in the Euston area).</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Common design elements update</p> <p>██████████ and ██████████ gave a presentation updating the Forum on progress on Common Design Elements (viaduct piers, overbridge and viaduct parapets, and lineside noise barriers) and the proposed next steps to seek agreement from the Planning Forum.</p> <p>EL (NWDC) noted that their Council logo is missing from slide 23, despite there being Key Design Elements in the District, which the District has been engaged on by HS2.</p> <p>There was general agreement in the Forum that while there had been a gap in engagement since the first working group in April the engagement should now continue through the working group. While it was agreed this is what the LPAs had been waiting for, there was a concern expressed that HS2’s proposal to have another working group in December was too ambitious.</p> <p>MD reminded the Forum that HS2 had always said that it would publish draft Planning Forum Notes on the CDEs and then hold another working group.</p> <p>EC (NCC) asked how HS2 were going to undertake the public engagement on CDEs. The discussion on this point was covered under item 5 on the agenda.</p> <p>CW said that HS2 would like to set up a second working group to look at the lineside noise barrier CDE early in the New Year.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>In response to DW (SNDC), MD said that the draft Planning Forum Notes to be issued in the next few days would capture the CDE design proposals for parapets and piers that were about to be shown in the presentation to follow.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) noted that the EK programme is currently showing submission of viaducts early in 2019, which are likely to include noise barriers. The timing of the CDE work stream is therefore very important so that early Sch 17 submissions are clear on the design of the noise barrier component.</p> <p>In response to a question by EL (NWDC) about the timing of the Planning Forum's endorsement of a CDE and engagement with the public by HS2, MD said that in HS2's view (subject to the LPAs' agreement) the best approach might be for the public engagement process to begin after provisional endorsement of a CDE by the Planning Forum. HS2 would then take the CDE proposal back to the Planning Forum for final agreement, amended as necessary following the public engagement. There was general agreement that this was an acceptable approach.</p> <p>██████████ (Moxon Architects) presented the piers and parapets CDE proposals in more detail. Some slides indicating the status of noise barrier options being considered were also shown.</p> <p>In response to questions from DJ (SAC), CW confirmed that the noise barrier working group would be considering the aesthetic appearance of noise barriers. The technical requirements for noise barriers are a given but do influence the visual appearance.</p> <p>SL (LDC) asked if there are solutions that are more aesthetically pleasing but have a higher cost. CW said that cost is an important factor, but the way in which noise barriers are procured can influence cost.</p> <p>SL said noise barriers can make or break the final appearance of the high quality structures being designed. Giles Thomas said he agreed with this point - noise is one of HS2's biggest systems integration issues. The overarching objective is to minimise noise generated by the track and rolling stock and hence minimise the need for noise barriers on structures.</p> <p>DW (SNDC) said there did not appear to have been any further development of the parapet and pier CDE proposals. Noise will have a critical impact on design but HS2 is planning to take forward viaduct Sch 17 submissions in the New Year without having resolved the noise barrier CDE proposal. There is a disconnect that needs to be resolved. CW said that the parapet CDE does not include parapets where there is a requirement for noise mitigation ie. there are structures where no noise barriers will be required which can be progressed.</p> <p>IN (CDC/ SBDC) said the Colne Valley Viaduct design was stopped as the noise barriers could not be accommodated. IN said the working group should therefore include a noise specialist. TA noted that LPA representation was up to the LPAs.</p>	
---	--

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>DW (SNDC) said that a concern had been raised previously that an appropriate appraisal of local distinctiveness needs to be undertaken. This will be a key part of community engagement and it is to be hoped that this is something that can be taken forward in future discussions.</p> <p>NS (CDC/ SBDC) said that discussions have commenced with EK on designs that include CDEs. Should the Council stop work on these. CW said we would need to look at the programme for these works. TA noted that a disconnect between Schedule 17 discussions and the CDE work-stream programme had been raised before.</p> <p>EL (NWBC) asked if the aspiration for a route-wide coherence and identity extend to highways structures. CW said that it does, with a respect for the local place.</p> <p>JF (HCC) said that the detail of crash protection needs to be considered at the working group.</p> <p>Action: HS2 to arrange next meeting of piers and parapets CCE working group, and to set up noise barrier CDE working group.</p> <p>([REDACTED] and [REDACTED] left the meeting after this item).</p>	<p>HS2</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Engagement with communities on design</p> <p>[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] gave a presentation describing engagement with communities on design as required by Information Paper D1 (ie. stations, key design elements and common design elements).</p> <p>For stations, the engagement approach has focused on exhibitions, and a range of media activity. Engagement on key design elements has followed the same approach with an emphasis on engagement close to the structure in question. For common design elements, digital engagement platforms are likely to be used due to their route-wide nature.</p> <p>The HS2 Community Engagement Strategy defines what is meant by engagement (consulting, informing, involving and responding). Consultation occurred during the Phase 1 Hybrid Bill Stage. In Phase 1 HS2 is now in the ‘informing’, ‘involving’, and ‘responding’ stage with an open dialogue with communities and key stakeholders to gain their views.</p> <p>Engagement has occurred in a range of different venues using different media, aiming to reach people from as broad a range of backgrounds and ages as possible. Curzon Street Station was shown as an example of how engagement on station designs is working.</p> <p>HS2 will be responding to communities and stakeholders summarizing the outcome of the engagement and how the design has responded to the views expressed, prior to the Schedule 17 submissions being made.</p>	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<p>Examples of engagement on key design elements were illustrated with the range of activities and events to engage on Wendover Dean and Small Dean viaducts and the Chiltern tunnel south portal (among the first examples of engagement on key design elements).</p> <p>MS confirmed that HS2 does need to target younger age groups by visiting schools.</p> <p>TA asked how HS2 is going to engage the public on common design elements. IA said the engagement principles for stations and key design elements apply equally to CDEs. However, the plan for common design elements will need to focus carefully on how to explain to the public how the CDE affect them and where, which is more challenging than for stations and key design elements.</p> <p>DW said the community had an expectation that there would be similar engagement for all key design elements. Another expectation that LPAs will need to manage is that under the normal planning regime the LPA is expected to engage with the public. Dialogue with communities needs to be planned carefully to occur at the right time so that communities feel engaged in the design process. There is a lack of understanding currently as to how common design elements will respond to local context and how that is brought into the community engagement process.</p> <p>IA noted there is a tension between common design elements and local context. DW noted that there is an assurance that the design should respond to local context and this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>CW said that there is flexibility for the design of piers, for example, to respond to local context. DW said in relation to parapets, for example, the opportunities for adjusting the top two-thirds of a parapet need to be explored, which may be more visible than the bottom third. CW noted that this could be discussed in the working group.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Community engagement and helpdesk update</p> <p>██████████ gave a Community Engagement and Helpdesk Update (see slide pack).</p> <p>SG noted that the first public progress report has now been published, which has been circulated to the LPAs and is available on-line. It shows how HS2 has informed, involved and responded during the first part of 2018.</p> <p>The presentation covered the community survey run by Ipsos-Mori, capturing local history, the Chipping Warden volunteer days, archaeological and station engagement events, Phase 2A information events and Phase 2B consultation.</p> <p>JF (HCC) asked for an update on the HS2 ‘one-stop shop’ bus at the next Forum. Action: HS2 to provide update at next Planning Forum on one-stop shop bus.</p>	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>7.</p>	<p>LA comments on Schedule 17 process The local authorities highlighted the following issues with Schedule 17 applications received to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JF (HCC) said there was confusion about how or whether conditions on Schedule 17 approvals could address, for example, the need for Environmental Site Management Plans to be updated or revised. PG noted that the Act could not be invoked to require LEMPs to be provided through the Sch 17 process. MD said the Schedule 17 Statutory Guidance outlines the principle that the Schedule 17 process should not be used to duplicate controls in the EMRs, but suggested that to assist authorities, Planning Forum Note 5 could be amended to make this clearer. • SL (LDC) suggested a standard template for an advisory note/ Informative that could be applied to Schedule 17 approvals, noting how the EMRs are binding on HS2 and how key matters (eg. management of traffic or ecology) are controlled through the EMRs and not through the Schedule 17 process. This was generally supported by the Forum as a way of helping to explain to the wider public the powers in the Act and relationship to the EMRs. Action: HS2 to propose amendments to Planning Forum Note 5 to address the above two points. • IN (CDC/ SBDC) noted that the assurances relating to the HEX depot remain despite the powers in Act relating to HEX now not being exercised. No response to CDC/ SBDC’s latest letter has been received from DfT. PG noted this was not a Sch 17 issue but HS2 would chase up the response to the letter. Action: HS2 to chase up response to CDC/ SBDC’s letter regarding HEX. • DW (SNDC) said that generally Schedule 17 applications have been satisfactory. In some cases the location plans have been poor quality - generally location plans should be based on the OS base mapping and be appropriate to the context. • DP (WCC) asked for the railway trace to be put on location plans to aid locating the works on the Council’s GIS system. LM have sent the information when requested. It was agreed this would be helpful. Action: HS2 to propose draft guidance to contractors on location plans. • DJ (SAC) noted that authorities were dissatisfied with the inaccuracy of forward plans, which made planning resources difficult. JF (HCC) said that the information given at regular interface meetings were now more useful. MD accepted that it had been difficult to provide accurate Sch 17 dates on a 3 monthly basis but HS2 would keep issuing them on the basis of the best information available at the time. 	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
------------------	--	----------------------------------

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN (CDC/SBDC) said that changing Schedule 17 dates creates uncertainty and instability and might mean that resources are not in place when required. SL said authorities need to know when the spikes in submissions are predicted, in order to deliver its obligations, hence the forward plans are of paramount importance. • MD noted that the forward plans do show when pre-application discussions are planned, in addition to submission dates. MD asked DW if the package timeline bar-charts that had been issued by EK, for example, are a useful format to receive the information in, as they enable the peaks of Sch 17 consenting activity to be clearly identified. • There was a general discussion about the difficulty authorities are experiencing in organising and planning internal resources through the SLA and/or funding agreements given the ongoing uncertainty about programme. It was noted that [REDACTED] had indicated under item 3 on the agenda that HS2 recognised that the burden should not fall on the LPAs where uncertainty was caused by changes to HS2’s submission programme. 	
<p>8.</p>	<p>Update on OCS design</p> <p>[REDACTED] (HS2) summarized the current status of the OCS (overhead catenary system) design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS2 will use single track cantilever design, similar to that used on HS1. • In locations where there are four tracks (eg. Calvert railhead and stations) there will be a need for portal structures. However the portal gantry structures used on the Great Western Main Line by NR will not be used on HS2. • The frequency of the masts is a function of the wire tension and predicted wind speed. The maximum practical distance between masts is approximately 64 metres. On viaducts, the distance can be reduced to line up with viaduct piers but the distance cannot be increased beyond the maximum. • HS2 has developed a reference design. The contractor will propose a system, which they will show to the Planning Forum for information. The contractor is not obligated to consider the proposals that came out of the DfT design completion (which was not HS2 specific). • The contractor for track and overhead line is yet to be appointed; the tender process is about to begin. • Phase 1 will use the same OCS design route-wide. 	

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

<p>9.</p>	<p>Planning Forum Notes Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFN 11 (Site Restoration) and 12. Now on the HS2 website. • Draft PFN 6 (Appendix A: conditions on lorry route approvals). Action: HS2 to issue for comment after the Planning Forum. • Draft PFNs on Parapets (PFN 14) and Piers (PFN 15) Common Design Elements. Action: HS2 to issue for comment after the Planning Forum. • Draft Planning Forum Note 13. Comments received from CDC/ SBDC and AVDC. Any other comments to be forwarded asap. Action: HS2 to respond to comments and propose any amendments for consideration at next Planning Forum. • Draft Planning Forum Note 16 (operational noise). Action: HS2 to issue draft for comment. 	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Forward Plan/ AOB</p> <p>The Forward Plan was agreed, noting that the agenda needs to be managed to focus on core planning and time-critical matters. It was clarified that the operational noise item for January will cover the noise barrier CDE and the Planning Forum Note on operational noise. Future meetings will always include a community engagement and helpdesk update.</p> <p>The following items were covered under AOB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prolonged Disturbance Scheme. DfT is considering the outcome of the consultation held on the scheme. A final scheme is expected to be announced in the New Year. • Clarification of potential for overlap between Prolonged Disturbance Scheme and the Construction Complaints process. This will be addressed once the Prolonged Disturbance Scheme is finalised. Action: HS2 to provide an update on both issues at January EH sub-group. • Update on Rural Broadband. JB (HS2 Ltd) said HS2 is not funded to deliver broadband as part of the railway, but HS2 is required to work with communities to leave a legacy benefit. HS2/ EK/ OpenReach/ Bucks LEP are working to utilize fibre being installed at HS2 worksites for the benefit of local communities. Generally the rural areas are likely to benefit most (Bucks, Warwickshire, Northants) from the eight HS2 main works compounds that will receive fibre broadband, as more urban areas generally have better existing provision. 	<p>HS2</p>

INDEPENDENT PHASE ONE PLANNING FORUM FOR HS2

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLAs. JB asked if LPAs were aware of HS2’s signatories to SLAs not being recognized by the Local Authority’s legal department. JF (HCC) said the issue was that the HS2 signatories were not listed as Company Directors at Companies House. TA asked that this was solved on a bilateral basis. • EC (NCC) said that it was taking a long time to have invoices paid, given that timesheets also have to be approved beforehand. The process needs to be clarified. DP said that the majority of LPAs have not signed up to the new timesheet. Action: HS2 Third Party Assurance Managers to liaise with LPAs to establish who is using what format of invoicing. • JF (HCC) asked what HS2’s Brexit strategy is given the need to source some plant/material from abroad. Action: HS2 to ensure answer is given at Ecology Review Group. • TA noted the Raynsford Report mentions non-disclosure agreements associated with HS2. Action: HS2 to provide a link to the Raynsford Report. • DW asked whether the Chairman has received a new contract. TA said that a new contract is in the process of being agreed. • The location of the meeting was discussed. It was agreed that the current arrangement of one meeting will remain, alternating between London and Birmingham. <p>The Forum noted that [REDACTED] is leaving Lichfield Council and expressed its thanks for his service at the Planning Forum.</p> <p>The next meeting is on the 24th January 2019 in London.</p>	<p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>HS2</p>
--	--	----------------------------------